UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/692,995	10/20/2000	Dean F. Jerding	A-6687	8091

			EXAMINER
5642	7590	03/27/2006	BELIVEAU, SCOTT E

SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
5030 SUGARLOAF PARKWAY
LAWRENCEVILLE, GA 30044

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/692,995	JERDING ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Scott Beliveau	2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*27 February 2006*</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *80,82,83,85,86,90-101 and 122* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) *122* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *80,82,83,85,86 and 90-101* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR

1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 27 February 2006 has been

entered.

Election/Restrictions

2.   Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

    I.   Claims 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, and 90-101, drawn to subcombination I, classified in

        class 725, subclass 89.

    II.   Claim 122, drawn to subcombination II, classified in class 725, subclass 88.

3.   The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single

combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not

obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In

the instant case, subcombination I has separate utility such as the particular usage of only

local memory to store bookmarking information without stopping the presentation. Invention

II has separate utility associated with presenting the user with a listing of available pre-

assigned titling options for bookmarking when a presentation is stopped. See MPEP
§ 806.05(d).

4.   Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and
have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction
for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5.   Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the
inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for
examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6.   During a telephone conversation with Mr. Jeffrey R. Kuester on 15 March 2006 a
provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of subcombination
I, claims 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, and 90-101. Affirmation of this election must be made by
applicant in replying to this Office action. Claim 122 is withdrawn from further
consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

7.   Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the
inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the
currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the
application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37
CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Priority

8.   Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or
under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged. Applicant has not complied with one

or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 119(e)

or 35 U.S.C. 120. The later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an

invention which is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original

nonprovisional application or provisional application). The disclosure of the invention in the

parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the

requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v.*

Performance Contracting, Inc., 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

The disclosure of the prior-filed application, Application No. 09/590,488, fails to provide

adequate support or enablement in the manner provided by the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C.

112 for one or more claims of this application. The subject matter that is common between

the two application appears to be related to the overall system architecture and ordering

process as illustrated in Figures 1-6. Figure 19C of the earlier '488 application, appears to

correspond to Figure 7 of the instant application. However, the earlier filed application does

not appear to disclose or illustrate the particular usage of the "bookmark" process as claimed.

Accordingly, the claimed subject matter shall not receive the priority of an earlier filling with

respect to the '488 application.

Similarly, the disclosure of the prior-filed application, Application No. 09/590,488, fails

to provide adequate support or enablement in the manner provided by the first paragraph of

35 U.S.C. 112 for one or more claims of this application. The provisional application

generally introduces the concept of a bookmark in conjunction with the "current rental

screen" (Page 13). Accordingly, the provisional application does not appear to perform

bookmarking without interrupting the visual presentation or only utilizing local memory as

claimed. For the purposes of evaluation of prior art with respect to applicant's claim to

priority, the application filing date shall be the filing date of the instant application or 20

October 2000 with respect to examination of claims 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, and 90-101.

Response to Arguments

9.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, and 90-101 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

11.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent

any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to

point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the

time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35

U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12.   Claims 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, and 90-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Lawler et al. (US Pat No. 5,585,838) in view of Russo (US Pat No.

5,619247), and in further view of Tsumagari et al. (US Pat No. 6,480,669).

In consideration of claim 80, the Lawler et al. reference discloses "method implemented

by a television set-top terminal (STT) [18] that is "coupled via a bi-directional network" [14]

(Col 5, Lines 7-19) to a "server" [32] "located remotely from the STT in a cable television

headend" [12] (Col 5 , Line 54 – Col 6, Line 6). The method comprises "receiving via a

tuner in the STT" [50] a "video presentation provided by the server located in the cable

television headend, wherein the video presentation is a video-on-demand presentation" and

"outputting by the STT at least a portion of the video presentation as a video-on-demand

television signal" [20] (Col 7, Lines 14-51) responsive to a user request for the

delivery/presentation of video-on-demand programming. The reference, however, is silent

with respect to the particular usage of "bookmarking" and local storage using the local

recording device in association with the particular video-on-demand presentation.

In an analogous art pertaining to the field of video distribution systems, the Russo

reference discloses a method for the particular delivery and presentation of video-on-demand

services which further utilizes localized storage (Col 3, Line 39 – Col 4, Line 27). As

illustrated in Figure 2, the method involves "receiving via a tuner" [104] in the "STT"

[4/10/14] a "video presentation . . . wherein the video presentation is a video-on-demand

presentation" which has been locally stored [110]. The user may subsequently "output by the

STT at least a portion of the video presentation as a video-on-demand television signal" (Col

5, Line 66 – Col 6, Line 8; Col 7, Lines 34-61; Col 10, Line 51 – Col 11, Line 4).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made so as to employ the video-on-demand delivery method of Russo for

the purpose of providing a simplified and inexpensive means by which to facilitate video-on-

demand services which does on place a heavy burden on the distribution facilities and further

provides the viewer with a wider choice of programming at the subscriber's convenience

(Russo: Col 1, Lines 12-42; Col 2, Lines 1-14; Col 2, Line 57 – Col 3, Line 11).

Accordingly, taken in combination, the reference provide a means by which a subscriber may

request a video presentation which is subsequently delivered on an on-demand basis to local

storage whereupon the user may request playback and control the playback of that

presentation having been locally stored.

While the combined references provide for the playback of the locally stored video-on-

demand presentations and the ability to control the playback of the recorded media, the

combined teachings do not particularly disclose the usage of "bookmarking" in association

with controlling the playback of recorded media. In an analogous art related to the problem

associated with bookmarking media presentations, the Tsumagari et al. reference discloses a

method for bookmarking a video presentation implemented by a local storage/playback

device (Figure 29). In particular, the method involves "receiving a first user input associated

with bookmarking a visual scene contained in the video presentation, including receiving a

character sequence to be assigned to the visual scene while the video presentation is being

presented to the user; storing information related to the visual scene in a memory of the [local

storage/playback device] responsive to receiving the first user input, including storing only in

the memory of the [local storage/playback device] information related to the visual scene in

response to receiving the first user input, including storing only in the memory of the [local

storage/playback device data corresponding to the character sequence in response to

receiving the user input configured to assign the character sequence to the visual scene"

(Figures 31-32; Col 27, Line 62 – Col 29, Line 17). The local storage/playback device

subsequently is operable to "output . . . at least another portion of the video presentation" and

"output . . . a signal . . . comprising a portion of the video presentation starting from a

location corresponding to the visual scene responsive to the second user input, wherein the

location corresponding to the visual scene is identified by the [local storage/playback device]

using the information related to the visual scene, including using information related to the

visual scene stored only in the [local storage/playback device]" (Figures 38-39; Col 31, Line

37 – Col 32, Line 37) Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify the local storage/playback

device or "STT" of the combined references with the teachings of Tsumagari et al. for the

purpose of advantageously providing the user with a method to bookmark video presentation

during their recording/playback (Tsumagari et al.: Col 1, Lines 14-24 and 59-64).

Claim 82 is rejected wherein the method further comprises "receiving a plurality of user

input configured to assign a plurality of respective character sequences corresponding to a

plurality of respective visual scenes that were bookmarked responsive to a plurality of

respective user inputs" (Tsumagari et al.: Figures 34-35; Col 30, Line 19 – Col 31, Line 8).

Claim 83 is rejected wherein the method further "receives a user input configured to

request information related to the visual scene in the video presentation; and providing the

requested information responsive to receiving the user input configured to request

information" (Tsumagari et al.: Figures 40-42; Col 32, Line 38 – Col 33, Line 34).

Claim 85 is rejected wherein the method further comprises "outputting information

confirming that the visual scene has been bookmarked wherein the information overlays a

minority portion of a television screen being used to display the video presentation". For

example, as illustrated in Figure 39 of Tsumagari et al., the particular display of a thumbnail,

time, title, attribute, etc. (as highlighted for the entry 'party') provides information

confirming that that particular scene has been bookmarked and the information, as displayed,

occupies a small or minority portion of the screen (~ 1/6th).

Claim 86 is rejected wherein "the information configuring that the visual scene has been

bookmarked includes at least one of . . . an icon" (Tsumagari et al.: Figure 39)

Claim 90 is rejected in light of Figure 39 of Tsumagari et al. which illustrates that the

"visual scene is associated with a bookmark list associated with a plurality of visual scenes

associated with a plurality of respective user inputs" which served to establish those

bookmarks.

In consideration of claim 91, the Russo discloses that the system is operable to be utilized

by a plurality of users and to further store a plurality of video presentations wherein each has

their own respective storage area(Col 11, Lines 16-30). As previously set forth, the

Tsumagari et al. reference discloses the method further comprises "associating a plurality of

visual scenes with a . . . bookmark list associated with a . . . respective user responsive to a

plurality of respective user inputs". Accordingly, taken in combination, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art so as to "associate a plurality of visual scenes

with a plurality of respective bookmark lists associated with a plurality of respective user

responsive to a plurality of respective user inputs" for the purpose of providing greater

flexibility in allowing individual users to control and manage their own storage account. For

example, a parent may not want a child to access bookmarked scenes corresponding to adult

programming.

In consideration of claim 92, the Russo discloses that the system is operable to be utilized

by a plurality of users and to further store a plurality of video presentations wherein each has

their own respective storage area (Col 11, Lines 16-30). As previously set forth, the

Tsumagari et al. reference discloses the method further comprises "associating a plurality of

visual scenes with a . . . bookmark list associated with a plurality of respective video

presentations responsive to a plurality of respective user inputs". Accordingly, taken in

combination, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art so as to

"associate a plurality of visual scenes with a plurality of respective bookmark lists associated

with a plurality of respective video presentations responsive to a plurality of respective user

inputs" for the purpose of providing greater flexibility in allowing individual users to control

and manage their own storage account. For example, a parent may not want a child to access

bookmarked scenes corresponding to adult programming.

Regarding claim 93, the Russo reference discloses "after expiration of a renal access

portion corresponding to the video presentation" that various options are available including

deleting or saving the program in the memory of the STT [4/10/14] such that the system

operates in accordance with the user desires (Col 4, Lines 53-55). However, the reference is

unclear if the user is necessarily "prompted to provide input indicating whether the

information is to be deleted from the memory of the STT" (Col 11, Lines 11-15). The

examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE as to the practice of "prompting [a user] to provide

input" to select between available options. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify the

combined teachings so as to "prompt the user to provide input indicating whether the

information is to be deleted from the memory of the STT" for the purpose of providing a user

friendly means so as to provide the user with the opportunity to express/establish their

preferences.

Claim 94 is rejected wherein the method further comprises "storing an image

corresponding to the visual scene in a memory of the STT responsive to receiving the first

user input" (Tsumagari et al.: Figure 39; Col 31, Lines 28-32).

Claim 95 is rejected wherein the "second user input requesting the visual scene

corresponds to a thumbnail image corresponding to the visual scene, the thumbnail image

being simultaneously provided with a plurality of thumbnail images corresponding to a

plrualtiy of visual scenes in the video presentation" (Tsumagari et al.: Figure 39; Col 31,

Line 37 – Col 32, Line 37).

In consideration of claim 96, the Lawler et al. reference discloses a "television set-top

terminal (STT) [18] that is "coupled via a bi-directional network" [14] (Col 5, Lines 7-19) to

a "server" [32] "located remotely from the STT in a cable television headend" [12] (Col 5 ,

Line 54 – Col 6, Line 6). The "STT" [18] comprises a "tuner" [50] that is "configured to

receive a motion video presentation provided by the server located in the cable television

headend, wherein the video presentation is a video-on-demand presentation", a "memory"

[60] and a "processor" [58]. The "processor" [58] is "programmed to output at least a portion of the motion video presentation as a video-on-demand television signal" [20] (Col 7, Lines 14-51) responsive to a user request for the delivery/presentation of video-on-demand programming. The reference, however, is silent with respect to the particular usage of "bookmarking" and local storage using the local recording device in association with the particular video-on-demand presentation.

In an analogous art pertaining to the field of video distribution systems, the Russo reference discloses a method for the particular delivery and presentation of video-on-demand services which further utilizes localized storage (Col 3, Line 39 – Col 4, Line 27). As illustrated in Figure 2, the system comprises a "STT" [4/10/14] comprising a tuner" [104] that is operable to receive and output a "motion video presentation as a video-on-demand television signal" which has been locally stored [110] (Col 5, Line 66 – Col 6, Line 8; Col 7, Lines 34-61; Col 10, Line 51 – Col 11, Line 4). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to employ the video-on-demand delivery method of Russo for the purpose of providing a simplified and inexpensive means by which to facilitate video-on-demand services which does on place a heavy burden on the distribution facilities and further provides the viewer with a wider choice of programming at the subscriber's convenience (Russo: Col 1, Lines 12-42; Col 2, Lines 1-14; Col 2, Line 57 – Col 3, Line 11). Accordingly, taken in combination, the reference provide a means by which a subscriber may request a video presentation which is subsequently delivered on an on-demand basis to local storage whereupon the user may request playback and control the playback of that presentation having been locally stored.

While the combined references provide for the playback of the locally stored video-on-

demand presentations and the ability to control the playback of the recorded media, the

combined teachings do not particularly disclose the usage of "bookmarking" in association

with controlling the playback of recorded media. In an analogous art related to the problem

associated with bookmarking media presentations, the Tsumagari et al. reference discloses an

apparatus for bookmarking a motion video presentation implemented by a local

storage/playback device (Figure 29). In particular, the apparatus "stores information related

to a visual scene contained in the motion video presentation only in the memory of the [local

storage/playback device] responsive to the [local storage/playback device] receiving a first

user input associated with the visual scene, without stopping output of the motion video

presentation, wherein the first user input includes a character sequence to be assigned to the

visual scene, and wherein the information related to the visual scene includes data

corresponding to the character sequence" (Figures 31-32; Col 27, Line 62 – Col 29, Line 17).

The local storage/playback device subsequently is operable to "output . . . at least another

portion of the motion video presentation as a video-on-demand television signal" and "output

responsive to the [local playback/storage device] receiving a second user input a video-on-

demand television signal comprising a portion of the motion video presentation starting from

a location corresponding to the visual scene, including user information related to the visual

scene stored only the memory of the [local playback/storage device] wherein the video-on-

demand television signal comprising the portion of the motion video presentation starting

from a location corresponding to the visual scene is output after the at least another portion of

the motion video presentation is output as a video-on-demand television signal" (Figures 38-

39; Col 31, Line 37 – Col 32, Line 37) Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify the local

storage/playback device or "STT" of the combined references with the teachings of

Tsumagari et al. for the purpose of advantageously providing the user with a method to

bookmark video presentation during their recording/playback (Tsumagari et al.: Col 1, Lines

14-24 and 59-64).

Claim 97 is rejected in light of Figure 39 of Tsumagari et al. which illustrates that the

"visual scene is associated with a bookmark list associated with a plurality of visual scenes

associated with a plurality of respective user inputs" which served to establish those

bookmarks.

In consideration of claim 98, the Russo discloses that the system is operable to be utilized

by a plurality of users and to further store a plurality of video presentations wherein each has

their own respective storage area (Col 11, Lines 16-30). As previously set forth, the

Tsumagari et al. reference discloses that the "processor is programmed to associate a

plurality of visual scenes with a . . . bookmark list associated with a . . . respective user

responsive to a plurality of respective user inputs". Accordingly, taken in combination, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art so as to modify the

"processor [to be] programmed to associate a plurality of visual scenes with a plurality of

respective bookmark lists associated with a plurality of respective users responsive to a

plurality of respective user inputs" for the purpose of providing greater flexibility in allowing

individual users to control and manage their own storage account. For example, a parent

may not want a child to access bookmarked scenes corresponding to adult programming.

In consideration of claim 99, the Russo discloses that the system is operable to be utilized

by a plurality of users and to further store a plurality of video presentations wherein each has

their own respective storage area (Col 11, Lines 16-30). As previously set forth, the

Tsumagari et al. reference discloses that the "processor is programmed to associate a

plurality of visual scenes with a . . . bookmark list associated with a plurality of respective

video presentations responsive to a plurality of respective user inputs". Accordingly, taken

in combination, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art so as to

modify the "processor [to be] programmed to associate a plurality of visual scenes with a

plurality of respective bookmark lists associated with a plurality of respective video

presentations responsive to a plurality of respective user inputs" for the purpose of providing

greater flexibility in allowing individual users to control and manage their own storage

account. For example, a parent may not want a child to access bookmarked scenes

corresponding to adult programming.

Regarding claim 100, the Russo reference discloses "after expiration of a renal access

portion corresponding to the video presentation" that various options are available including

deleting or saving the program in the memory of the STT [4/10/14] such that the system

operates in accordance with the user desires (Col 4, Lines 53-55). However, the reference is

unclear if the "processor is configured to prompt the user to provide input whether the data is

to be deleted from the memory of the STT" (Col 11, Lines 11-15). The examiner takes

OFFICIAL NOTICE as to the practice of "prompting [a user] to provide input" to select

between available options. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify the combined teachings

such that the "processor is configured to prompt the user to provide input whether the data is to be deleted from the memory of the STT" for the purpose of providing a user friendly means so as to provide the user with the opportunity to express/establish their preferences.

Claim 101 is rejected wherein the "processor is configured to enable the STT to store in the memory an image corresponding to the visual scene responsive to receiving the first user input" (Tsumagari et al.: Figure 39; Col 31, Lines 28-32).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as follows. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objections made.

- The Lewis (WO 00/04726 A1) reference discloses a system and method wherein a user is operable to enter a text description for bookmarking a scene while the presentation continues to play.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Beliveau whose telephone number is 571-272-7343. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access

to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197

(toll-free).

Scott Beliveau
Examiner
Art Unit 2614

SEB
March 19, 2006